across the Suvernavati river to secure regular feeding of water to Amble, Yelandur, Yeriyur and Maddur tanks, mentioned in G.O. No. 233-35, dated 16th February 1896 ?

(*b*) Has the work been carried out as mentioned therein?

(*c*) Is it true that materials were collected ten years ago for the construction of the anicut?

(*d*) Has acreage contribution been recovered with the assurance of converting dry lands into wet?

(*e*) What is the extent of land in each village converted into wet?

(*f*) What is the amount of contribution recovered on account of these lands in each village?

(*g*) Is the Government aware of the fact that on account of insufficient supply of water to the existing wet lands as well as new wet lands, the raiyats are impoverished?

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.—

A.—41. (*a*) Yes.

(*b*) The anicut at Ganiganur has been raised and Maddur tank arranged to be fed from this anicut.

(*c*) Some stones were collected.

(*d*) Acreage contribution was promised and in some cases recoveries have been made.

(*e*) Information is not readily available.

(*f*) Yelandur, Rs. 547-13-4; Maddur. Rs. 1,904-9-3; Yeriyur, Nil; Amble, Rs. 4,219-15-11.

(*g*) No.

MR. V. BANDAYYA (Nanjangud Taluk).—

Q.—42. Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) What is the total income from 1920 to 1929-30 (yearwar) of all the Civil Courts in the State including Process Department and what is the balance after deducting expenditure ?

(*b*) When and why was the value of stamps for suits and processes raised ?

(*c*) Was the change permanent or temporary when the value was raised ?

(*d*) Did not the Government express their intentions at the Legislative Council meeting of June 1927 (see page

418) that they did not want to know the income of each party ?

(*e*) What are the reasons for not complying with the requests of the people ?

(*f*) Is it possible to form the net income derived from Civil Courts into a fund and utilise it for constructing Civil Courts buildings and quarters for staff ?

(*g*) Has it not come to the notice of Government that officials are put to much inconvenience for want of dwelling houses in places where Courts are established and if so, what are the facilities created ?

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, LAW DEPARTMENT.—

A.—42. (*a*)

Year	Total income from all the Civil Courts including Process Department	*Expenditure shown under Civil Courts	Difference
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1920–21	7,81,647	6,08,425	1,73,222
1921–22	8,41,625	5,95,417	2,46,208
1922–23	9,16,991	5,73,916	3,43,075
1923–24	10,31,584	6,14,775	4,16,809
1924–25	10,45,580	6,25,344	4,20,236
1925–26	11,25,311	6,57,082	4,68,229
1926–27	10,74,441	6,48,328	4,26,113
1927–28	12,22,796	7,25,803	4,96,993
1928–29	11,98,646	7,71,759	4,26,887

* This does not include expenditure on buildings, pensions, audit, etc.

(*b*) The rates of court fees were enhanced with effect from 1st February 1923. The rates existing prior to 1923 were rates fixed in 1900 on the scale obtaining in British India. The rates were revised in British India so as to secure 50 to 100 per cent increase in certain cases for the purpose of meeting increased cost of administration. The need for enhancing here too was recognised and recommended by the Special Finance Committee, and rates have accordingly been revised.

The rates of process fee were enhanced with effect from 14th October 1927 in view of the large increase in expenditure involved in giving effect to the recommendations of the

Laws Delays Committee and with a view to meet the extra cost on account of the measures for the improvement in the pay and prospects of the process establishment.

(*c*) There is no reason to think that the enhancement was intended to be only temporary.

(*d*) No such intention was expressed.

(*e*) In view of the financial position and in view of the additional facilities created by way of additional courts it is not possible to effect reduction in the rates.

(*f*) No.

(*g*) No such general complaint has been received.

MR. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA (Nagamangala Taluk).—

Q.—43. Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) Is it a fact that the raiyats holding lands under Sulekere tank in Kasaba Hobli, Nagamangala Taluk, have petitioned to connect it with Singarasinkere tank to increase the supply of water?

(*b*) What action has been taken by Government in the matter?

(*c*) How many years ago did the raiyats put in their petitions?

(*d*) Is it a fact that the raiyats below the tank have agreed to pay contribution?

(*e*) If so, why the tank work has not been started?

(*f*) Whether the Government will be pleased at least to order the taking up of the work now?

(*g*) Has it come to the notice of Government that, on account of insufficient supply of water, the whole wet *atchkat* under the tank is not irrigated?

(*h*) If so, has any concession been shown to any of the raiyats who have sustained losses ?

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.—

A.—43. (*a*) Yes.

(*b*) The question was investigated.

(*c*) 10 years ago.

(*d*) No.

(*e*) The cost was considered to be very high and the raiyats did not come forward with any contribution.

(*f*) This will be considered on its merits, if the raiyats are willing to make an adequate contribution.